



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cl
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,451	09/16/2004	Taketo Hayashi	229632	2396
23460 7590 04/04/2007 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731			EXAMINER BERCH, MARK L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/500,451

Applicant(s)

HAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Mark L. Berch

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 200008025, 6184376, 5352669, Spassova, et al., MacCross et al., Bzowska et al., or 4801710.

In WO 200008025, see example 18. The product is precipitated out of water. In Bowles, see last paragraph in column 1 on page 478, a crystallization from aqueous ethanol. In US 6184376, see example 31e, in which it was crystallized from water. In 5352669, see column 6, lines 38-52, showing the material crystallized from either water or ethanol/water (4:5). In Spassova, et al., see page 1173, where the material is crystallized from ethanol. In 4801710, see example 1, where the material was precipitated from aqueous solution. In MacCross et al., see footnote 13, showing crystallization from ethanol/water. In Bzowska, see sentence bridging columns of page 1057, which teaches crystallization from ethanol/water.

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 1-3, 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 6414112.

In US 6414112 B1, see example 64 where the material was crystallized from ethanol.

The references teach the claimed compound precipitated out of water, ethanol, or a mixture thereof. The reference is silent on whether the material was in the form of a solvate or what particular crystalline habit the material had. However, if the material does indeed form an alcoholate, and the prior art does crystallize the material from an alcohol, then it is reasonable to assume that the prior art formed an alcoholate.

MPEP 2112 states:

“SOMETHING WHICH IS OLD DOES NOT BECOME PATENTABLE UPON THE DISCOVERY OF A NEW PROPERTY

The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).”

In this case, the “unknown property” is the particular crystalline form. This is unknown because the reference is silent on this property. MPEP 2112 goes on to state:

“A REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102/103 CAN BE MADE WHEN THE PRIOR ART PRODUCT SEEMS TO BE IDENTICAL EXCEPT THAT THE PRIOR ART IS SILENT AS TO AN INHERENT CHARACTERISTIC

Where applicant claims a composition in terms of a function, property or characteristic and the composition of the prior art is the same as that of the claim but the

Art Unit: 1624

function is not explicitly disclosed by the reference, the examiner may make a rejection under both 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, expressed as a 102/103 rejection.”

Again, the “CHARACTERISTIC” which the prior art is silent on is the crystalline form (crystalline form is considered to be in the category of chemical properties; see *Zenith Laboratories Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.* 30 USPQ2d 1285, 1288).

This is not an ordinary inherency situation where it is not explicitly stated what the product actually is. In every reference applied, the reference explicitly teaches exactly what the compound is. In fact, it is the opposite. In a normal inherency situation, the claim is of known structure, and the reference is of unknown structure. Here, the reverse is true, and hence the legal circumstances of inherency in the prior art do not apply. The only difference is the property about which the reference happens to be silent.

See for example *Ex parte Anderson*, 21 USPQ 2d 1241 at 1251, discussion of Rejection E. The claims had “numerical or functional values for certain properties which [the authors of the references] did not measure”. The PTO presented no reasoning as to why the prior art material would have been expected to have those properties. Instead, the decision states, “There is ample precedent for shifting the burden to an applicant to reproduce a prior art product whose final structure or properties are, at least, in part determined by the precise process used in its manufacture.” (page 1253).

In another example, certain claims of *Ex parte Raychem Corp.* 25 USPQ2d 1265 required a linearity ratio of less than 1.2. The decision notes that neither reference discloses any values of the linearity ratio. The PTO presented no reasoning as to what the ratio would be expected to be in the references. The Decision states: “However, this does not end the inquiry since, where the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to perform

Art Unit: 1624

the needed testing, it is reasonable to shift the burden of proof to Raychem to establish that (1) the argued difference exists....”

And indeed, there have been a number of cases in which applicants have pointed to silence of the prior art with regard to this or that property: *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641; *In re Zierden* 162 USPQ 102; *In re Lemin*, 140 USPQ 273; *Titanium Metals Corporation of America v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773; *In re Benner*, 82 USPQ 49. Going further, if silence about properties of prior art compounds could be relied on, then one could not reject over references with no utility (see *In re Schoenwald*, 22 USPQ2d 1671), since applicants could always insert the utility into the claim as a property.

It is well settled that the PTO can require an applicant to establish that a prior art product does not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product when the prior art and claimed products are identical or substantially identical. An applicant's burden under these circumstances was described in *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-434 (CCPA 1977) as follows:

Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. . . . Whether the rejection is based on 'inherency' under 35 U.S.C. § 102, or 'prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. § 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products (footnote omitted).

Overcoming the rejection is very straightforward. One simply replicates the prior art procedure. If the claimed form does not appear at all in the product, or if on repetition, it sometimes does not appear in the product, then the rejection is overcome.

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 8-12 are included because the methods as claimed are completely generic.

These simply name the solvent and no more.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The only cubic crystals reported in the specification were for the hydrate --- see example 2. This can be fixed by making claim 6 a hydrate claim.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, as the claimed invention is not described, or is not described in such full, clear, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Specifically:

The claims are either miswritten (paragraph 2), or, if written correctly, are not enabled, (paragraph 1).


Art Unit: 1624

The crystallization process yielding a cubic or columnar crystal produces the hydrate or the alcoholate; see examples 1-3 and 5. The process for producing the benzylguanine itself is a non-crystallization process; see example 4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Berch whose telephone number is 571-272-0663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 - 3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on (571)272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Mark L. Berch
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

3/29/2007